

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 23-30, 33-44, and 47-50 were pending in this application. Claim 37 has been amended hereby to correct matters of form. Accordingly, claims 23-30, 33-44, and 47-50 will remain pending herein upon entry of this Amendment. For at least the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action mailed August 26, 2005, claims 23-30, 33-44, and 47-50 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Munson (US Patent No. 6,681, 331). To the extent these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection based upon Munson, Applicants note that the Examiner essentially presented a rejection of claim 37 and its dependent claims and then stated that that rejection applied equally to claim 23 and its dependent claims because "this claim is directed to the detection system of the method of claim 37 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale." In a telephone conversation on November 28, 2005, Applicants' representative pointed out to the Examiner that, notwithstanding Applicants continued disagreement over the applicability of the Munson reference to the pending claims, the "selection" recitation of claim 23 added via the previous amendment did not have an analog in claim 37 and, therefore, the rejection could not, in fact, equally apply to claim 23, as alleged.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Examiner stated that she would consider the references in light of that recitation and inform Applicants' representative if she believed that the presently cited references taught that recitation as well. The Examiner further stated that if Applicants' representative did not hear back from her regarding this issue that the Examiner was unable to find such a teaching relating to the selection of trained networks sufficient to uphold a rejection to claim 23. Applicants' representative did not receive a return call from the Examiner and have thus amended claim 37 to also include a selection step intended to correspond with the selection recitation of claim 23. Applicants believe that at least this selection process is not described in the presently cited art.

Accordingly, because each element recited in each of the independent claims is not present in either the Rowland (previously cited) or Munson references, Applicants assert that claims 23 and 37 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: December 22, 2005


Customer No. 00909

BCM/dkp

Respectfully submitted,

GHOSH ET AL.

By

  
Brett C. Martin  
Registration No. 52,000